DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 180 FL 003 617

AUTHOR Nakau, Minoru
TITLE Some Constraints on Topicalization.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. Japanese Linguistics Workshop.
PUB DATE Jun 72
NOTE 15p.; Portion of a Ph.D. dissertation submitted in 1971 to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology
JOURNAL CIT Papers in Japanese Linguistics; v1 n1 p74-88 Jun 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Deep Structure; *Japanese; Morphemes; Nominals; Semantics; *Sentence Structure; Surface Structure; *Syntax; Transformation Generative Grammar; *Transformations (Language)

ABSTRACT

This paper explains some properties and restrictions involved in phenomena of topicalization in Japanese. The first section reviews certain properties involved in simplex topical sentences; the second section reveals certain constraints on topicalization involved in complex sentences. Section Three pursues one consequence suggested by those constraints, namely, the existence of a rule of complement subject-raising in Japanese. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In: Papers in Japanese Linguistics; Vol. 1, No. 1, June 1972.

ED 069180

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Some Constraints on Topicalization*

Minoru Nakau
Tokyo Gakugei University

0. This paper is concerned with explicating some properties and restrictions involved in phenomena of Topicalization in Japanese. Section 1 will point out, or more precisely mostly review, certain properties involved in simplex topical sentences, and Section 2 will reveal certain constraints on Topicalization involved in complex sentences. Finally, Section 3 will pursue one consequence suggested by those constraints, namely, the existence of a rule of Complement Subject Raising in Japanese.

1.1. A general property characteristic of this rule is that only Noun Phrases may be topicalized and that the topicalized element is marked with the Particle wa attached to it, as in:

(1) a. Siizaa-wa, Buruutasu-ga koros-i-ta
'Caesar' Top(Obj) 'Brutus' Sub 'kill' Pst [1]
"As for Caesar, Brutus killed him/*Ø"

b. Nihon-ni-wa, onsen-ga oo-i
'Japan''in' Top 'hot spring' Sub 'many' Pres
"There are many hot springs in Japan / (Literally)
*As for 'in Japan', hot springs are many"

1.2. There are the same selectional restrictions between topical sentences and the associated non-topical sentences. One piece of evidence is the fact that any Noun Phrase must retain the same Particle, if there is one at all, in the topical sentence as that in the corresponding non-topical sentence. Thus compare the members of the following pairs:

(2) a. Taroo-ni-wa, boku-ga Ziroo-o syookaisi-ta
IO Top 'I-male, friendly' Sub DO 'introduce'
"As for Taro, I introduced Jiro to him" Pst

b. Boku-ga Taroo-ni Ziroo-o syookaisi-ta
"I introduced Jiro to Taro"

(3) a. Amerika-kara-wa, ookuno gakusee-ga sankasi-ta
'America''from' Top 'many' 'student' 'participate'
"(Literally) *As for 'from America', many students took part (in it)"

b. Ookuno gakusee-ga Amerika-kara sankasi-ta
"Many students took part (in it) from America"

This fact suggests that topical sentences must be derived from the underlying structures containing the associated non-topical sentences,

© "PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Minoru Nakau TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

FL003 617

because no explanation is otherwise available for why a particular case Particle is present in the topicalized element.

1.3. The Particles ga and o never occur followed by the topical Particle wa, while the other Particles must remain in most cases as they are in the corresponding non-topicalized element.

(4) a. {Bruutasu-wa, / *Bruutasu-ga-wa,} Siizaa-o koros-i-ta
"As for Brutus, he killed Caesar"

b. {Siizaa-wa, / *Siizaa-o-wa,} Bruutasu-ga koros-i-ta
"As for Caesar, Brutus killed him"

c. {Nitiyoobi-wa, / Nitiyoobi-ni-wa,} gakkoo-ga yasumi-da
'Sunday' 'on' 'school' 'closed' Pres
"As for Sundays, school is closed"

d. {*Taroo-wa, / Taroo-to-wa,} Hanako-ga konyakusi-ta
'with' 'be engaged' Pst
"As for Taro, Hanako was engaged to him"

It is not immediately clear which Particles can delete and under what conditions they can delete. I will not go into it further here.

1.4. In connection with the optionality of case Particles in the topicalized Noun Phrases, another piece of evidence comes up which suggests that the same selectional restrictions exist between topical sentences and non-topical sentences. It is concerned with the fact that an ambiguous topical sentence corresponds to as many non-topical sentences as it has readings. Thus (5a) seems to be ambiguous in three ways; it may involve three different interpretations (5b), (5c) and (5d), although its most natural reading is (5c).

(5) a. Huzi-san-wa, wareware-ga nobot-ta
'Mt. Fuji' 'we' 'climb' Pst
"As for Mt. Fuji, we climbed"

b. Wareware-ga Huzi-san-o nobot-ta
Dimension[2]
"We climbed up Mt. Fuji"

c. Wareware-ga Huzi-san-ni nobot-ta
Goal
"We climbed Mt. Fuji to a certain point/to the top"

d. Wareware-ga Huzi-san-e nobot-ta
Direction
"We climbed up to Mt. Fuji"

As may be apparent from the English counterparts, Particle selection affects meaning. The Particle o marks a dimension along which the action of climbing takes place; the Particle ni marks a goal of the action; and the Particle e marks a direction in which the action goes rather than its goal. Note further that we have topical versions which lead uniquely to the interpretation of (5c) and (5d), although we have no other topical version than (5a) which involves the interpretation of (5b). Thus: Huzi-san-ni-wa/Huzi-san-e-wa/*Huzi-san-o-wa, wareware-ga nobot-ta.

Observation of such ambiguous topical sentences also suggests that topical constructions must be derived from the underlying forms of the associated non-topical constructions, so that the ambiguity involved can be accounted for. In particular, it is necessary to topicalize a Noun Phrase together with the Particle. This, then, suggests the existence of a rule which deletes the Particles o and ga before wa obligatorily, as in (4a) and (4b), and other Particles optionally under some conditions yet to be discovered, as in (4c).

1.5. More than one Noun Phrase can be topicalized in a single sentence, and there is no necessary ordering restriction among the topicalized elements. Any order of them seems to preserve meaning.

(6) a. Kinoo-wa, gakkoo-de-wa, boku-wa, isogasi-kat-ta
'yesterday' 'school''in' 'I' 'busy' Pst
"As for yesterday, and as for school, and as for me, I was busy"

b. Boku-wa, kinoo-wa, gakkoo-de-wa, isogasi-kat-ta
"As for me, and as for yesterday, and as for school, I was busy"

c. Gakkoo-de-wa, boku-wa, kinoo-wa, isogasi-kat-ta
"As for school, and as for me, and as for yesterday, I was busy"

1.6. There is a certain type of topical sentences where the topical elements are not so obviously recoverable in the underlying forms as the cases noted above. Thus observe the following sentences:

(7) a. Sakana-wa, tai-ga i-i
'fish' 'red snapper' Sub 'good' Pres
"As for fish, red snappers are good"

b. Saru-wa, tinpanzii-ga kasiko-i
'ape' 'chimpanzee' Sub 'clever' Pres
"As for apes, chimpanzees are clever"

It can be perceived that the semantic relation holding between the topical elements and the subject Noun Phrases is that of inclusion.

Contrast (7) with the non-topical sentences in (8), which most

likely correspond to (7).

(8) a. Sakana-no tai-ga i-i
Variant of the Copula da
"Red snappers, which are fish, are good"

b. Saru-no tinpanzii-ga kasiko-i
Variant of the Copula da
"Chimpanzees, which are apes, are clever"

These sentences sound strange, because they are more likely to be taken as involving restrictive relative clauses, although there exists no such thing as that which is a red snapper but which is not fish. But these sentences are acceptable to me in the senses of the English counterparts, which contain non-restrictive relative clauses. What is relevant, therefore, is that the semantic relation involved in Noun Phrases like sakana-no tai-ga in (8a) is not that of possession, but that of inclusion, exactly the same relation involved in topical sentences like (7a). Thus (8) can be the underlying forms of (7).

The sentences in (8) themselves will be derived from the underlying structures containing relative clauses in (9), by Relative Clause Formation and a very general rule which morphologically alternates the Copula da to no in the context immediately followed by a Noun Phrase.

(9) a. $[[$ Tai$_i$ ga sakana da $]_S$ tai$_i$ ga $]_{NP}$ i i

b. $[[$ Tinpanzii$_i$ ga saru da $]_S$ tinpanzii$_i$ ga $]_{NP}$ kasiko i

It is observed that the Copula da in the relative clauses of (9) involves an inclusion relation which holds between the two Noun Phrases. This analysis thus seems to provide the most natural explanation for the source of the topical Particle wa in (7) and an inclusion relation implicit in it.

It might be alternatively proposed that the underlying forms of (7) would be something like the following:

(10) a. Sakana-no-naka-de tai-ga i-i
'fish' Pos 'inside' 'in'
"Red snappers are good among fish"

b. Saru-no-naka-de tinpanzii-ga kasiko-i
"Chimpanzees are clever among apes"

Corresponding to these sentences, we would have the following topical sentences as well:

(11) a. {Sakana-no-naka-de-wa, / Sakana-de-wa,} tai-ga i-i
"As for fish, red snappers are good"

b. {Saru-no-naka-de-wa, / Saru-de-wa,} tinpanzii-ga kasiko-i
"As for apes, chimpanzees are clever"

(7) could thus be transformationally related to (10) and (11). It should be noted, under this analysis, that an ad hoc rule must be postulated which deletes a particular Noun naka "inside".

1.7. There are certain cases where only the head Noun of a Noun Phrase can be topicalized, leaving a copy behind. Thus contrast the members of each of the following pairs:

(12) a. Hana-wa, zoo-no sore-ga naga-i
'nose' 'elephant'Pos 'that' Sub 'long' Pres
"As for noses, those of elephants are long"

b. Hana-wa, zoo-no-ga naga-i
Pos? Sub
"As for noses, those of elephants are long"

c. Zoo-no hana-ga naga-i
Pos Sub
"An elephant's nose/trunk is long"

(13) a. Suutu-keesu-wa, sikaku-i no-ga yo-i
'suitcase' 'square' Pres 'one' Sub 'good' Pres
"As for a suitcase, a square one is good/better"

b. Sikaku-i suutu-keesu-ga yo-i
"A square suitcase is good/better"

Contrasting (13a) and (13b) shows that the topicalization of the head Noun which is modified by an Adjective (and analogously, by a Nominal Adjective like genki(-da) "(be) well") leaves behind the indefinite Pronoun no "one" in the original position. On the other hand, it is observed in (12) that the topicalization of the head Noun which is modified by a possessive Noun Phrase leaves behind the indefinite Pronoun sore "that", as in (12a), or nothing, as in (12b). There seems to be no compelling reason, however, to believe that in (12b) the morpheme no is a possessive Particle and hence no copy is left behind, although it is quite conceivable, and I personally think it is correct, that (12b) is derived from (12c) through the intermediate stage of derivation *Hana-wa, zoo-no-no-ga naga-i by deleting the indefinite Pronoun no, rather than the possessive Particle no, for a purely phonological reason.

1.8. One thing must be made clear, especially to those readers who know about phenomena of Topicalization in English. Although the rule which I refer to as Topicalization in Japanese involves basically the same operation in crucial cases as that in English, the semantic effect of the former is entirely different from that

of the latter. While the topical element in English functions as the focus of the sentence, that in Japanese constitutes the major portion of the presupposition. Observe the following examples, which bring out this point clearly:

(14) a. Zoo-wa, hana-wa naga-i ga,
'elephant'Top 'nose' Contr 'long' Pres 'but'
me-wa tiisa-i
'eye' Contr 'small' Pres
"As for an elephant, the nose is long, but the eyes are small"

b. Taroo-wa tenisu-ga uma-i ga,
Contr 'tennis' Obj 'good' Pres 'but'
Ziroo-wa uma-ku-na-i
Contr 'good' 'not' Pres
"Taro is good at tennis, but Jiro is not (good at it)"

Observe first (14a). What is relevant is the fact that the two different types of the Particle wa are involved in (14a). The Particle wa attached to hana "nose" and me "eye" is contrastive, because those Noun Phrases are in contrastive position. The Particle wa attached to zoo "elephant" offers a framework within which the contrast takes place, and thus is the topic. Since it is true that the contrastive elements are the foci of the sentence, the Noun Phrases hana-wa and me-wa constitute the foci of (14a). Then the topic can never be the focus, and hence it constitutes part of the presupposition of the sentence. This seems to me a quite natural conclusion, since the topic is a frame of reference within which the comment is going on.

Along these lines, consider (14b). Since they are clearly in contrast with each other, the wa-phrases Taroo-wa and Ziroo-wa are the foci of the sentence. Hence, the other elements, which constitute a contrastive framework, are part of the presupposition of the sentence. The fact that the Noun Phrase tenisu-ga is not (necessarily) repeated in the second conjunct provides supporting evidence for this conclusion, because the presupposition by its nature need not be explicitly mentioned. Now observe the following sentence, which contains tenisu-ga as the topic:

(15) Tenisu-wa, Taroo-wa uma-i ga,
'tennis' Top(Obj) Contr 'good' Pres 'but'
Ziroo-wa uma-ku-na-i
Contr 'good' 'not' Pres
"As for tennis, Taro is good (at it), but Jiro is not (good at it)"

Note that this sentence preserves the focus as it was in (14b), and hence the presupposition also remains the same. Therefore, the topic is in the presupposition. The only difference between (14b) and (15)

lies in the absence or presence of the topic.

The interrelation between two correlative notions "topic-comment" and "focus-presupposition" in Japanese can thus be defined in the following manner: the topic always constitutes part of the presupposition of the sentence, and the comment always contains the focus of the sentence. It is of course an independent problem how the focus and presupposition can be specified in Japanese. In the preceding paragraph, I discussed the problem of focus and presupposition in exclusive connection with the clearest case of contrastive sentences.[3]

2.1. One salient restriction on Topicalization with respect to complex sentences seems to be that no Noun Phrase of an embedded sentence (i.e., a complement sentence, a relative clause and a subordinate clause) whose subject is present in surface structure can be topicalized to the next higher sentence. To illustrate this point, I will focus primarily on the subject Noun Phrases of pertinent embedded constructions. What holds true of those subject Noun Phrases will turn out to hold true of all other Noun Phrases, e.g., object Noun Phrases, of the same constructions. Thus observe the following paradigms of sentences:

(16) Noun sentential complements in subject position:

a. ⌈Taroo-ga doroboo dat-ta ⌋$_S$ to-yu-u syooko-ga
Sub 'thief' 'be' Pst Comp[4] 'evidence' Sub
agat-ta
'come out' Pst
"Evidence that Taro was the thief has come out"

b. *Taroo-wa, ⌈doroboo dat-ta ⌋$_S$ to-yu-u syooko-ga agat-ta
Top
"As for Taro, evidence that he/*∅ was the thief has come out"

Cf. ⌈Taroo-wa doroboo dat-ta ⌋$_S$ to-yu-u syooko-ga
Contr
agat-ta
"Evidence that Taro, but nobody else, was the thief has come out"

(17) Noun sentential complements in object position:

a. Daremo ⌈Taroo-ga yagaku-ni kayot-te-i-ru ⌋$_S$
'anyone' Sub 'night school' 'to' 'attend' Dur Pres
koto-o sir-a-na-i
Nom Obj 'know' 'not' Pres
"Nobody knows (the fact) that Taro goes to night school"

b. *Taroo-wa, daremo ⌈yagaku-ni kayot-te-i-ru ⌋$_S$ koto-o
Top
sir-a-na-i

"As for Taro, nobody knows (the fact) that he/*Ø goes to night school"

(18) To Predicate sentential complements preposed:

a. ⌈Denwa-ga kosyoosi-ta⌋$_S$ to,
'telephone' Sub 'get out of order' Pst Comp
Taroo-wa {it-ta / 'say' Pst / omot-ta / 'think' Pst}
Top
"That his telephone got out of order, Taro said/thought"

b. *Denwa-wa, ⌈kosyoosi-ta⌋$_S$ to, Taroo-wa {it-ta / omot-ta}
Top
"As for his telephone, Taro said/thought that it/*Ø got out of order"

Cf. ⌈Denwa-wa kosyoosi-ta⌋$_S$ to, Taroo-wa {it-ta / omot-ta}
Top
"Taro said/thought, "As for my telephone, it got out of order""

(19) Yoo-ni Predicate sentential complements: [5]

a. *Isya-ga Ziroo$_i$-ni ⌈Ziroo$_i$-ga kusuri-o
'doctor' Sub IO Sub 'medicine' Obj
nom-u⌋$_S$ yoo-ni susume-ta
'drink' Pres Comp 'advise' Pst
"The doctor advised Jiro to take medicine"

b. *Ziroo$_i$-wa, isya-ga Ziroo$_i$-ni ⌈kusuri-o nom-u⌋$_S$
Top
yoo-ni susume-ta
"As for Jiro, the doctor advised him to take medicine"

(20) Relative clauses (together with the head Noun Phrases) preposed:

a. ⌈Ziroo-ga setumeesi-nak-kat-ta⌋$_S$ zyookyoo-o
Sub 'explain''not' Pst 'situation' Obj
boku-wa setumeesi-ta
'I-male, friendly'Top(Sub)
"The situation which Jiro did not explain, I explained"

b. *Ziroo-wa, ⌈setumeesi-nak-kat-ta⌋$_S$ zyookyoo-o,
Top
boku-wa setumeesi-ta
"As for Jiro, I explained the situation which he/*Ø did not explain"

(21) Subordinate clauses:

a. ⌈Taroo-ga sore-o yar-u ⌋$_S$ nara, kimi-wa
Sub 'it' Obj 'do' Pres 'if' 'you' Top/Contr
(sore-o) yar-a-na-ku-te-mo-yo-i (Sub)
'it' Obj 'do' 'not' 'also''good' Pres
"If Taro does it, you may not do it"

b. *Taroo-wa, ⌈ sore-o yar-u ⌋$_S$ nara, kimi-wa(sore-o)
Top
yar-a-na-ku-te-mo-yo-i
"As for Taro, if he/*Ø does it, you may not do it"

The contrast between (a) and (b) in each pair shows that the subject Noun Phrase of an embedded sentence cannot be topicalized to the beginning of the next higher sentence.

Supporting evidence that the underlined wa-phrase in (b) of each pair is not attached to the next higher sentence, moving out of the original embedded sentence, is provided by observing that, contrary to the general property of Topicalization that any scrambled order is possible among topicalized phrases of the same sentence (cf. Section 1.5), the wa-phrase in question cannot be scrambled with the topical wa-phrases of the same sentence to which that wa-phrase is allegedly attached. Thus the best example comes from (20b) in the following manner:

(22) a. *Boku-wa, ⌈setumeesi-nak-kat-ta ⌋$_S$ zyookyoo-o, Ziroo-wa setumeesi-ta
"As for me, and as for Jiro, he/*Ø explained the situation that I/*Ø did not explain"

b. *Ziroo-wa, boku-wa, ⌈setumeesi-nak-kat-ta ⌋$_S$ zyookyoo-o setumeesi-ta
"*As for Jiro, and as for me, Ø explained the situation which Ø did not explain"

c. *Boku-wa, Ziroo-wa, ⌈setumeesi-nak-kat-ta ⌋$_S$ zyookyoo-o setumeesi-ta
"*As for me, and as for Jiro, Ø explained the situation which Ø did not explain"

Consider first (22a), which is exactly the same as (20b) except for the interchange of Ziroo-wa, originating as the embedded subject, and boku-wa, the wa-phrase obviously topicalized on the level of the higher sentence. If (20b) were grammatical, then we would reasonably expect that (22a) is also grammatical, and that it contains the meaning of the source sentence (20a). But this is not the case at all. It can thus be inferred that the ungrammaticality of (20b) stems from the assumption that Ziroo-wa, originally the embedded subject, is attached to the next higher sentence by Topicalization.

Consider next (22b) and (22c), where the two wa-phrases are scrambled at the beginning of the same higher sentence. These strings are ungrammatical because their meaning is indeterminate,[6]

or more specifically, because the meaning of the source sentence (20a) is unrecoverable from (22b) and (22c). This unrecoverability clearly stems from the same assumption, that is, that Ziroo-wa, originally the embedded subject, is attached to the next higher sentence by Topicalization. I conclude, therefore, that the underlined wa-phrase in (b) of each pair of sentences above is not attached to the next higher sentence out of the original complement sentence.

2.2. Another salient property of Topicalization with respect to complex sentences seems to be the restriction that no Noun Phrase, including a subject Noun Phrase, of an embedded sentence can be topicalized within the same embedded sentence. It is only in a contrastive interpretation that wa-phrases are possible in embedded sentences. Examine the following strings, which have the (a) sentences in (16) through (21) as their source sentences:

(23) a. ⌈Taroo-wa doroboo dat-ta ⌋$_S$ to-yu-u syooko-ga
Contr/*Top 'thief' 'be' Pst Comp 'evidence'
agat-ta (=16c)
'come out' Pst Sub
"Evidence that Taro, but nobody else, was the thief has come out"

b. Daremo ⌈Taroo-wa yagaku-ni
'anyone' Contr/*Top 'night school''to'
kayot-te-i-ru ⌋$_S$ koto-o sir-a-na-i
'attend' Dur Pres Nom Obj 'know''not' Pres
"Nobody knows (the fact) that Taro (but not Jiro) goes to night school"

c. ⌈Denwa-wa kosyoosi-ta ⌋$_S$ to,
'telephone' Contr/Top 'get out of order' Pst Comp
Taroo-wa it-ta / omot-ta (Cf. 18c)
Top 'say'Pst 'think' Pst
"Taro said/thought that his telephone, but nothing else, had got out of order (Contrastive) /
Taro said/thought "As for my telephone, it got out of order (Topical)"

d. *Isya-wa, Ziroo$_i$-ni ⌈Ziroo$_i$-wa kusuri-o
'doctor' Top(Sub) IO *Top 'medicine' Obj
nom-u ⌋$_S$ yoo-ni susume-ta
'drink' Pres Comp 'advise' Pst
"*The doctor advised Jiro$_i$ that, as for Jiro$_i$, he should take medicine"

e. ⌈Ziroo-wa setumeesi-nak-kat-ta ⌋$_S$ zyookyoo-o
Contr/*Top 'explain''not' Pst 'situation' Obj
boku-wa setumeesi-ta
'I' Top(Sub) 'explain' Pst

"I explained the situation which Jiro (but not Taro) did not explain"

f. ?*⌈Taroo-wa ⌋S sore-o yar-u nara,
?Contr/*Top 'it' Obj 'do' Pres 'if'
kimi-wa (sore-o) yar-a-na-ku-te-mo-yo-i
'you' Contr 'not' 'also''good' Pres
"If Taro, but not you, does it, then you may not do it"

The underlined wa-phrases of (a), (b), (e) and (f) in (23) have only a contrastive interpretation, as is apparent in the English counterparts. Sentence (23c), which contains a to Predicate sentential complement to the Verbs of saying and thinking yuw-u "say" and omow-u "think", will constitute apparent counterevidence to our claim, because such to-complements carry the force of direct quotes even if there are no syntactic markers for direct quotes.[7] String (23d), which contains a yoo-ni complement, is ungrammatical, because the source string (19a) itself is unacceptable and requires the deletion of the complement subject Ziroo(-ga) under identity with the indirect object of the higher sentence Ziroo(-ni). I conclude, therefore, that particularly the subject Noun Phrase of an embedded sentence cannot be topicalized within the same embedded sentence.

We have thus far observed that the subject Noun Phrase, and analogously other Noun Phrases, of an embedded sentence cannot be topicalized either in the same embedded sentence or to the next higher sentence. We will later see one additional generalization concerning the type of complex sentence whose embedded sentence has no subject Noun Phrase in surface structure.

3.1. One implication by those constraints seen in Section 2 for a certain type of sentential complement construction is the necessity of postulating a rule of Complement Subject Raising in Japanese.

Observe first the following paradigm of sentences with rasi-i "likely", hazu-da "ought to/be expected to" and others as higher Predicates,[8] where the complement subjects are topicalized:

(24) a. Taroo-wa, amari benkyoosi-na-i rasi-i
Top(Sub) 'much' 'study' 'not' Pres 'likely' Pres
"As for Taro, he/*Ø is likely not to study too much"

b. Kono heya-wa, kura-i nitigaina-i
'this''room' Top(Sub) 'dark' Pres 'must' Pres
"As for this room, it/*Ø must be dark"

c. Hanako-wa, sono uwasa-o sit-te-i-ru hazu-da
Top(Sub) 'that''rumor' Obj 'know' Dur Pres 'ought to'
"As for Hanako, she/*Ø ought to know that rumor" Pres

d. Kare-no kuruma-wa, tootoo nusum-are-ta
'he'Pos 'car' Top(Sub) 'finally' 'steal' Pass Pst
soo-da
'be said to' Pres

"As for his car, it/*Ø is said to have stolen after all"

My perception that the underlined wa-phrases in (24) have the topical interpretation can be supported by the observation that they are understood exactly the same way as the wa-phrases in the simplex sentences in (25), corresponding exactly to the complement sentences in (24), are understood, namely, as topical phrases.

(25) a. Taroo-wa, amari benkyoosi-na-i
"As for Taro, he/*Ø does not study too much"

b. Kono heya-wa, kura-i
"As for this room, it/*Ø is dark"

c. Hanako-wa, sono uwasa-o sit-te-i-ru
"As for Hanako, she/*Ø knows that rumor"

d. Kare-no kuruma-wa, tootoo nusum-are-ta
"As for his car, it/*Ø was stolen after all"

Given these data, the discussion in Section 2 suggests that the underlined wa-phrases in (24) are attached to the higher sentences, but not to the original complement sentences, because the subject Noun Phrase of an embedded sentence cannot have the topical interpretation. The preceding discussion further reveals that the underlined wa-phrases in (24) must have been raised into the empty subject position of the next higher sentence before the independently motivated version of Topicalization can adequately operate, because this rule is so restricted that the embedded subject must not be topicalized to the next higher sentence. I conclude, therefore, that if we are to explain the topical phenomena in simplex sentences as (25), thereby achieving the most general formulation of Topicalization, then what follows necessarily is that there is a rule of Complement Subject Raising which raises the complement subject into the empty subject position of the next higher sentence.[9]

3.2. This conclusion is quite compatible with certain semantic considerations. Note first that the Predicates of the higher sentences in (24) are all speaker-oriented, i.e., they all express a psychological attitude of the speaker and that such Predicates typically appear in the highest sentences or direct quotes equivalent to the highest sentences. Note further that the notion of topic is also speaker-oriented. I can see no reason whatsoever, therefore, to suspect that the topical wa-phrases occur attached to the highest sentences or to direct quotes, particularly in such sentences as (24) with speaker-oriented Predicates.

Indirect evidence for this conclusion comes from the contrast between (24) and (26). The sentences in (26) contain Predicates which require lexically filled (human) subjects in deep structure.[10]

(26) a. Taroo-wa, amari benkyoosi-na-i tumori-da
Top(Sub) 'intend'Pres

"As for Taro, he/*Ø intends not to study too much"

b. Ziroo-wa, mamonaku Nippon-ni kaer-u
Top(Sub) 'soon' 'Japan''to' 'return' Pres
yotee-da
'plan' Pres
"As for Jiro, he/*Ø is planning to go back to Japan soon"

c. Ziroo-wa, sin-demo yar-i-nuk-u
Top(Sub) 'die''even if' 'do''through' Pres
kakugo-da
'determine' Pres
"As for Jiro, he/*Ø is determined to accomplish it even if he is going to die"

The underlined wa-phrases in (26) have the topical interpretation. The higher Predicates in (26), like tumori-da "intend" and yotee-da "plan", require the deletion of the complement subject Noun Phrase under identity with the subject Noun Phrase of the next higher sentence. Thus the input to Topicalization of, say, (26a) will be represented as, roughly, labelled bracketing (27a). If, on the other hand, the rule of Complement Subject Raising is assumed for the derivation of the sentences in (24) prior to the application of Topicalization, then (24a), for instance, will be specified as, roughly, labelled bracketing (27b).

(27) a. $\lceil$ Taroo ga $\lceil\lceil$ Ø amari benkyoosi na i $\rfloor_S$ tumori $\rfloor_{PredP}$ da $\rfloor_S$

b. $\lceil$ Taroo ga $\lceil\lceil$ Ø amari benkyoosi na i $\rfloor_S$ rasi $\rfloor_{PredP}$ i $\rfloor_S$

It is observed here that (26a) and (24a) are exactly parallel in the input structure of Topicalization. Since derived structure (27a) is independently motivated, it will provide indirect evidence for the plausibility of derived structure (27b) and hence for the need of the rule of Complement Subject Raising.

3.3. We observed in Section 2.1 that no Noun Phrase of an embedded sentence whose subject is present in surface structure can be topicalized to the next higher sentence. We are now in a position to observe another generalization, namely, that a Noun Phrase of an embedded sentence whose subject is not present in surface structure (i.e., has been deleted by Subject Deletion or raised by Subject Raising) can be topicalized to the next higher sentence, as in:

(28) a. Taroo-ga Ziroo$_i$-ni $\lceil$ Ø$_i$ sono hon-o yom-u $\rfloor_S$
Sub IO 'that''book'Obj 'read'Pres
{koto-o Nom DO / yoo-ni Comp} susume-ta
'advise' Pst

"Taro advised Jiro to read that book"
(Complement Subject Deletion involved)

b. Sono hon$_j$-wa, (Top(Obj)) Taroo-ga Ziroo$_i$-ni $\lceil \emptyset_i \ \emptyset_j$ yom-u $\rceil_S$ { koto-o / yoo-ni } susume-ta
"As for that book, Taro advised Jiro to read it"

(29) a. Taroo$_i$-ga (Sub) $\lceil \emptyset_i$ sono hon-o yon-da (Pst) $\rceil_S$ soo-da 'be said' Pres
"Taro is said to have read that book"
(Complement Subject Raising involved)

b. Sono hon$_j$-wa, (Top(Obj)) Taroo-ga $\lceil \emptyset_i \ \emptyset_j$ yon-da $\rceil_S$ soo-da
"As for that book, Taro is said to have read it"

Footnotes

* This paper is a unified version of two separate sections of my doctoral dissertation, Sentential Complementation in Japanese (MIT, 1971). A slightly revised version of the dissertation will be published in book form by Kaitakusha, Tokyo, in 1972. I am very grateful to Noam Chomsky, Kenneth Hale, Paul Kiparsky and John R. Ross for their valuable comments on the earlier versions of those two sections. I alone am responsible for any error which may have been made.

1 The abbreviated symbols attached to Japanese sentences are each intended to stand for the following: Top=Topic, Obj=Object, Sub=Subject, Pst=Past Tense, Pres=Present Tense, IO=Indirect Object, DO=Direct Object, Pos=Possessive, Contr=Contrastive, Comp=Complementizer, Dur=Durative, Nom=Nominalizer, Pass=Passive.

2 Several interesting observations about the behavior and meaning of the Particles o and ni, along with de "in", have been made in Kuno (1969).

3 For a discussion of the determination of the focus and presupposition of sentences with special reference to the Particles ga and wa, cf. Nakau (1969).

4 For a detailed discussion of the status of to-yu-u (and analogously, to and yoo-ni) as Complementizer, cf. Nakau (1971), Chapter IV.

5 I have listed yoo-ni sentential complements in their underlying forms, because these are the only candidates for the Topicalization of the complement subject Noun Phrase, which must be obligatorily deleted under identity with the indirect object Noun Phrase of the matrix sentence. For a full discussion of this rule of Complement Subject Deletion, cf. Nakau (1971), Chapter VI.

6 I am not saying that they are ambiguous.

7 For a discussion of syntactic criteria for direct quotation, cf. Nakau (1971), Chapter III, Section 1.

8 For some arguments that these are higher Predicates which have empty deep subjects and require sentential complements in pre-Predicate position, cf. Nakau (1971), Chapter V, Sections 1 and 2.

9 For some other arguments for the existence of this rule in Japanese, cf. Nakau (1971), Chapter V, Section 3.

10 For a couple of arguments for the correctness of this deep structure, cf. Nakau (1971), Chapter V, Section 1.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

———. 1969. Deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation. Semantics: an interdisciplinary reader, ed. by L. Jakobovits and D. Steinberg, 183-216. London: Cambridge University Press.

Kuno, Susumu. 1969. Notes on Japanese grammar (3). Unpublished paper, Harvard University.

———. 1970. Theme, contrast, and exhaustive listing—wa and ga in Japanese. Mathematical linguistics and automatic translation, Report No. NSF-24, 323-51. Cambridge, Mass.: Aiken Computation Laboratory, Harvard University.

Nakau, Minoru. 1969. Aspects of the Japanese particles wa and ga —focus and presupposition. Unpublished paper, MIT.

———. 1971. Sentential Complementation in Japanese. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Dept. of English, Tokyo Gakugei University
4-1-1 Nukuikita-machi, Koganei-shi
Tokyo 184, Japan